DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 201 HE 000 189

By-Mann, Jacinta

Faculty Participation in College Governance: Two Small Catholic Colleges.

Pub Date Jun 68
Note-47p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.45
Descriptors-*Administrative Policy, Administrator Attitudes, *College Administration, *Faculty Evaluation, *Governance, *Higher Education, Personnel Evaluation, Teacher Administrator Relationship, Teacher Role

An evaluation of faculty participation in administration was conducted at 2 Catholic liberal arts colleges in Winter 1967-68. Of the total lay and religious faculty selected at both institutions, almost 50% responded. The 59-item questionnaire dealt with the full-time faculty's perception of what academic governance is, what their role should be, and satisfaction with their actual role. It also asked for personal data -- level of education, rank, tenure, professional societies, research and campus activities. Both the men's and women's college faculties felt that they should have the major voice in academic decision making but that joint faculty-administration decisions should govern religious and lay personnel matters, financial, student, public and alumni affairs. In the area of capital improvements, the men wanted less administrative responsibility than the women. Dissatisfaction with actual decision-making roles was evident, but in the area of faculty-administration relations the women were less satisfied than the men, who were indifferent. The religious held higher degrees and academic ranks than the lay faculty, who were younger and stayed at the college for shorter periods. Both groups often participated in campus activities. A comparison of 33 pairs of mean weights for religious and lay faculty at each college revealed that on all but 7 of the 66, differences between the 2 groups at both colleges were insignificant, i.e., on nearly all variables concerning shared governance, agreement between the faculties was almost unanimous. Ten recommendations are appended. (WM)

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE:

TWO SMALL CATHOLIC COLLEGES

by

Sister M. Jacinta Mann, S.C.

ED025201

June 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025201

HE 000 189

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION: why study faculty governance 1

II. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY 6

III. A DESCRIPTION OF THE FACULTIES 7

IV. THE STATE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Faculty Perception of Its Role in Decision Making 15

Faculty Satisfaction with Its Role in Decision Making 19

Conditions and Arrangements Affecting Participation 22

Impediments to Faculty Participation 30

Summary of Religious-Lay and College Comparisons 35

V. RECOMMENDATIONS 38

References Cited 44

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Religious Status of Respondents	8
2	Distribution of Academic Rank	9
3	Distribution of Years on Faculty	9
4	Distribution of Degrees Held by Faculties	10
5	Chronological Age of Faculty Groups	10
6	Tenure Status of Faculty Groups	11
7	Faculty Involvement in Professional Societies	11
8	Authorship and Research Grants During Last Five Years	12
9	Participation in Certain College Activities	13
10	Mean Weights on Scale of Faculty-Administration Dominance in Decision Making	15
11	Mean Weights on Scale of Faculty Satifaction with Decision Making Role	19
12	What Contributes Most to Faculty Satisfaction	20
13	What Contributes Most to Faculty Dissatisfaction	21
14	Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Extent of Use of Devices for Decision Making	22
15	Where Faculty Members Go to Influence Decisions	25
16	Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Use of Informal Faculty Groups for Influencing Decisions	27
17	Faculty Perceptions of Administration Attitudes Toward Shared Governance	28
18	Faculty Perceptions of Their Own Attitudes Toward Participation in Governance	30
19	How Free the Faculty Members Feel to Take Positions on Important Issues Which are Contrary to Those of the Administration	31
20	Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Extent to Which Certain Factors are Impediments to Faculty Participation in Decision Making	34

I. INTRODUCTION

Many words can be found about faculty participation in the governance of colleges, but there are few statistics. In numerous periodicals and not a few books the nature, need, and extent of faculty participation--past, present, and future--have been verbalized extensively, but little empirical evidence exists. This study was planned simply to describe numerically certain aspects of faculty governance at two small Catholic liberal arts colleges, to begin to measure and perhaps to evaluate it as it exists at present. Also included are some recommendations for future actions.

Why should this study have been made? Why should any college feel a need for evaluating the nature and extent of faculty governance on its campus? In my mind, the reason is clear. Shared governance is an effective means by which the objectives of an institution can be realized. Furthermore, it is the <u>right</u> thing to foster. Though I will not burden the reader with a long apology, the literature of higher education, past and present, is filled with eloquent testimony to the rightness of faculty participation in college governance, and with the philosophical and pragmatic reasons for actually courting it in order to meet present-day problems.

Knowledgeable observers of the American scene hardly need access to educational journals to realize that higher education stands face to face with the possibility of strikes and collective bargaining becoming a part of its everyday life. And it is sadly true that with administrator and professor in an employer-employee relationship we have the antithesis of a community of scholars. The sense of academic community cannot exist without good communication among <u>all</u> the persons involved. Because of the very nature of a college, the flow of communication should be greater there than in any other social group. Indeed, whatever power inhibits communication impoverishes community. For this, if for

no other reason, shared power, shared problem-solving, and shared responsibility in the government of a college are desirable.

The political scientist, John Millett, professor of public administration, college president and now coordinator of a whole state system of higher education, when asked to think and write on the application of principles of public administration to the administration of higher education ended up by naming his book The Academic Community. The following quotation expresses an idea with which his entire volume is permeated (underlining is mine).

> The concept of community within the institution of higher education cannot survive if the power of administration is thought of as a supreme echelon in a hierarchy of authority. If the concept of hierarchy is accepted within a college, then administration becomes the fount of authority from which faculty, students, and alumni draw their respective roles, and under whose direction and control all activity is performed. Such a concept of authority, it seems to me, is alien to the great social purpose of higher education and does not conform with the facts of academic life. On the other hand, when the power of administration is conceived as a constituent element of a community of power, then the functions of that power are more definitely prescribed and the limitations of that power are more clearly understood (10:181).

For an especially poignant illustration of the devastation on an academic community which a failure to provide for shared governance can effect, the reader is referred to John Leo's description of the events that form the history of the Saint John's controversy (7:193-201). It appears that much of it could easily have been prevented if a "community of authority" had existed there instead of a "hierarchy of power," if the demands for subordination could have been replaced by the "dynamic of consensus."

And so one of the reasons for encouraging faculty participation in academic governance is to strengthen academic life by fostering community. Another is to keep the college in step with contemporary democratic thought; to let faculty, students, and administrators feel their relevance and have the support and strength this can bring to their work. In a Carnegie Foundation study John J. Corson counsels that unprecedented adaptability,

expansibility, and creativity will be required of the American colleges so that they can equip students for the "world of atoms, missiles, and new ideologies of 1960 to 2000." In describing what he sees as necessary for the future, he says:

> That effort must be equal to eliminating inflexible and tradition-bound practices, whether they have to do with the size of the institution or of its classes – with their traditional disciplines of knowledge – or with established notions about the institution's clientele. And that effort presumes that a working consensus will be reached among all members of the institution -- trustees, officers, faculty -- about what purpose is to be achieved by their institutions (3:3-4).

From the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education in Berkeley Warren Bryan Martin describes the division, indecisiveness and even militancy that can result when the various groups in academe hear only themselves because no provision is made for them to share ideologies and to build the fellowship and the discipline which are necessary for group living in a time when so many individuals suffer from the malaise of alienation (9:320-326).

Not only does encouragement of shared governance come from researchers in politics and higher education but there is a new emphasis on democratic processes in the business world as well. Douglas McGregor, former Antioch College president and later a professor of industrial management at M.I.T. wrote:

> The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves . . . The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals <u>best</u> by directing <u>their</u> <u>own</u> efforts toward organizational objectives (1:15).

The following observations from the report of the Danforth Foundation's systematic assessment of present-day church-related higher education in the United States point to the fact that the Catholic colleges have an especially great need to think about shared governance.

A major administrative problem in Roman Catholic institutions is the dominant position often held by members of a sponsoring religious order or congregation. This is coming to be an acute issue in many Catholic institutions as the number of lay faculty members increases rapidly. Faculty members frequently complain that they are treated as "employees," not as responsible participants in the life and government of institutions (12:80).

In Roman Catholic colleges and universities there is criticism of "heavy-handed" administration . . . a number of respondents commented on the cleavage that exists between the lay and religious faculties in many Roman Catholic institutions, the lay faculties being treated as "second-class" members of the teaching staff (12:175).

We urge trustees and administrators to give serious thought to the advantages of a group-leadership pattern. . . In our judgment the time-honored principles of college administration are much too rigid and doctrinaire to cope successfully with modern conditions of administration. . . . Roman Catholic higher education has special administrative and organization problems of its own -- for example, the composition and authority of boards of trustees and the relationship of lay and religious faculty members. These are matters requiring careful study in each institution. . . The Catholic colleges have lagged particularly in their adoption of modern tools of management (12:202-3).

It seems clear to me that to be relevant, to be colleges that make some difference in today's world -- yes, even to continue to exist -- we must acknowledge and be willing to act upon the following principles. We must admit that those affected by decisions should have a voice in their formulation; that a sense of common purpose cannot be secured without shared means of achieving that purpose; that "power with" is more appropriate to the dignity of the person than "power over;" that increasing specialization in the academic disciplines and burgeoning complexity in administrative structures should be faced squarely and not be allowed to increase impersonalization in the collegiate community; that any inequity existing between the lay and religious members of the academic community should be abolished; that it would be foolish to give students a voice in college governance, as is the present trend, and not share it even more intensely with the faculty.

Furthermore, it would be a pity not to take advantage of the problem solving abilities of faculty members. It is because they are thoughtful and knowledgeable that they have been

asked to associate with the college; and besides, their closeness to the learning situation frequently permits them to be better informed about the root of many problems than administrators are. Surely it would be a great waste not to tap for governance the asset of faculty thought.

To foster community, to be relevant to modern times, to utilize the asset of faculty thought; all are reasons for shared governance, all help to answer the question of why this study should have been made. And these convictions are strongly supported by the document drawn up after long study by the American Association of University Professors, published in 1962, and entitled "Faculty Participation in College and University Government: Statement of Principles." Here the AAUP takes the position that college and university government is the joint responsibility of the various major elements of the academic community: faculty, administration, trustees, students. The statement delineates the role that the faculty should play in setting educational policy, in making appointments and promotions in the teaching staff, in choosing administrative officers, and in budgeting. It recommends ways and means to set up agencies for faculty participation and points out that "the objective of all such arrangements should be to insure that the organized channels of communication between trustees, administrators and faculty are open and regularly used" (6:253-259).

There is evidence of wide support of and respect for this statement in the many reports of college and university AAUP chapters across the country. These reports have been published periodically since 1962 in the AAUP Bulletin and show that many colleges have made of the statement a criterion against which to judge the quality of their government. The present study should enable two small Catholic colleges to see how each faculty views its participation in governance and to estimate how near these perceptions are to the norms laid down by the AAUP.

II. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The colleges at which this study was conducted in the winter of 1967-68 are small but strong Catholic liberal arts colleges, one for men and one for women, located near each other in the eastern United States. The men's college, incorporated almost a hundred years ago, has a student population of 1031; the women's college, over fifty years old, has 719 students.

From a larger group of small private institutions which were available and willing to be studied, the two colleges were selected, first of all, because they are Catholic; and there appears to be the least evidence of and the most need for regular participation of faculty in governance at Catholic colleges. This need has been made apparent by the considerable agitation for faculty voice in Catholic institutions across the country. Furthermore, the women's college is engaged in a two-year long intensive self-study; and the data collected for the present investigation should add a valuable dimension to the mass of other information being gathered. Finally, these two colleges hope to cooperate more closely in the future and are even seeking funds to facilitate this endeavor. I noted during a year of administrative work at one of the six Claremont Colleges that idea generation in inter-institutional cooperation often depends more heavily on faculty members than on administrators. On the basis of a year's observation of those colleges and my participation in their cooperative activities I strongly believe that for the two colleges considered in this study to cooperate effectively, to enrich their service to students, the faculties will need to know themselves and each other much better than they do at present. It is hoped that this study will beget mutual interest and awareness at these institutions.

A questionnaire* was distributed at both colleges to all faculty members who taught at least eight credits in either semester of the academic year. Great care was taken

---

* Parts of it were adapted from an interview schedule used by Archie Dykes at a midwestern university and from a questionnaire employed by Robert Hubbell at a state university in California. I am grateful to these gentlemen.

to preserve the anonymity of the respondents. Of the 52 questionnaires distributed at the men's college 34 (65%) were returned; a much higher return, 56 of 61 (92%), was received from the faculty of the women's college. The substantially higher return from the women's college may be attributable to the fact that, as a member of the staff, virtually all the faculty know me, and one is much more likely to answer a questionnaire if one somehow identifies with the person distributing it. Few of the faculty of the men's college know me personally. However, in both cases, the percent return is quite respectable, and the reader can accept the results with reasonable confidence that they truly represent faculty thought.

The 59-item questionnaire was designed to obtain faculty opinion as to what their role in academic governance should be, to get their perceptions of what it actually is, and to ask for an indication of their satsifaction with their role. There were questions relating to the conditions and arrangements for participation, and to existing impediments to shared governance. The final group of questions concerned the faculty members themselves: their participation in professional societies, research activity, and campus affairs; and such items as their rank, tenure status, level of education, and so forth.

The analysis of the data collected with the questionnaire will be presented in the next two sections. Section III is a description of the faculty members who responded to the questionnaire. This description should help in understanding the analysis of faculty opinions about governance which follows in Section IV. The final portion of the paper is a list of recommendations for action by the college communities.

III. A DESCRIPTION OF THE FACULTIES

Because I would like to put to permanent rest the tendency to think about the faculties of Catholic colleges as religious and lay, I apologize for having to present any tables which point to such a dichotomy in these communities of scholars. It

Table 1

Religious Status of Respondents

Status	Women's College		Men's College	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Roman Catholic lay person	15	27%	17	50%
Lay person, not Catholic	13	23	5	15
Cleric or religious	24	43	11	32
No response	4	7	1	3
	56		34	

is hoped that delineating the differences where they appear may help to get some of them eliminated.

The first table shows that there are about the same number of lay respondents as religious at the women's college and that about half the laymen are Roman Catholic. In contrast, at the men's college there are twice as many laymen as religious and most of the laymen are Catholic. Since the respective proportions of lay and religious faculty who answered the questionnaire were nearly equal, the percentages in this table are a true representation of the makeup of the two academic communities.

Although the colleges differ markedly in the ratio of lay to religious faculty, there is parity between them in the overall distribution of academic ranks among these two groups. The two faculties are alike in that the combined percentages of the two upper and two lower ranks are much the same, i.e., 36% compared with 39%; 64% with 61% in Table 2. Also, they are alike in that at both colleges a greater percentage of the religious hold the upper two ranks than do laymen. Because it is the traditional policy in American higher education to associate the upper two ranks with tenure status, it seems reasonable to analyze these data with the upper and lower two ranks combined (13:14).

How can the generally lower ranks held by the laymen be explained? For one thing, there is evidence in Table 3 that they simply do not stay at the colleges long enough

Table 2

Distribution of Academic Rank

Rank	Women's College						Men's College					
	Religious		Lay		Total		Religious		Lay		Total	
Professor	25%	54%	11%	22%	17%	36%	18%	64%	5%	25%	10%	39%
Associate Professor	29		11		19		46		20		29	
Assistant Professor	46	46	28	78	38	64	18	36	15	75	16	61
Instructor	0		50		26		18		60		45	

to acquire the higher ranks. A study of the entries in the lowest category (1 - 6 years) of this table reveals that in both colleges about half the total faculty group have been at the colleges less than seven years; for the laymen the figures are about 70%. Comparing the mean number of years that the various groups have been at the colleges makes it very clear that religious are more likely than laymen to stay long enough to earn higher academic rank. Another dimension is added to the explanation by the fact that the religious faculty, as a whole, hold

Table 3

Distribution of Years on Faculty

Years on Faculty	Women's College			Men's College		
	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
37 - 42	4%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
31 - 36	5	0	2	0	5	3
25 - 30	5	0	4	0	0	0
19 - 24	18	8	12	28	0	10
13 - 18	18	8	12	0	10	6
7 - 12	23	15	20	36	15	23
1 - 6	27	69	48	36	70	58
Mean Years	14.4	6.7	10.6	10.6	7.1	8.3

higher degrees than the laymen. The data summarized in Table 4 substantiate this. In this respect it can be noted that the women's college is richer in doctorates among the faculty as a whole than the men's college is and that the religious faculty of the women's college is better educated than the religious faculty at the men's college.

Table 4

Distribution of Degrees Held by Faculties

Highest Degree	Women's College			Men's College		
	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
Doctorate	39%	14%	24%	27%	14%	19%
Master	52	61	57	55	67	62
Baccalaureate	9	25	19	18	19	19

Related to these two situations, first that the lay members as compared with religious are less well educated at the time of their presence in the two academic communities and secondly that they stay a shorter time at the colleges than the religious, is the fact that in general the laymen are younger than the religious. See Table 5. At both colleges the average age of laymen is less than that of religious, the men's college having a younger faculty, as a whole, than the women's college.

Table 5

Chronological Age of Faculty Groups

Age	Women's College			Men's College		
	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
60 or over	26%	7%	18%	0%	10%	6%
50 - 59	9	4	6	36	0	13
40 - 49	26	33	29	19	14	16
30 - 39	39	26	32	36	33	34
Under 30	0	30	15	9	43	31
Mean age	46	38	43	43	35	38

One would expect that the answers to the question "Do you have tenure?" would be in general agreement with the results outlined above, that since the religious faculty are older, have more education and have remained longer, they would be tenured in greater proportion than the laymen. And this is true at the men's college, where 55% of the religious are tenured versus 24% of the laymen. See Table 6. But at the women's college there

Table 6

Tenure Status of Faculty Groups

Do you have tenure?	Women's College			Men's College		
	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
Yes	21%	25%	23%	55%	24%	34%
No	21	57	42	27	71	56
Don't know	58	18	35	18	5	10

appears to be great confusion concerning the issue. Very many faculty members, 58% of the religious and 18% of the laymen, do not even know if they have tenure or not. Since so many are in doubt, it would hardly be safe to draw any conclusions other than that the laymen are certainly more sure of their status than the religious.

Table 7

Faculty Involvement in Professional Societies

	Women's College	Men's College
I. Attend meetings annually or oftener	60%	65%
Attend meetings less than annually	40	35
II. Held office in society	15%	9%
Never been an officer	85	91
III. Participated on program	13%	21%
Rarely or never have been on program	87	79

Several other aspects of the faculties remain to be described - their participation in professional societies as well as the extent of their involvement in outside research and writing and in campus affairs. The religious and lay faculties are so much alike in their record of involvement with professional societies that I have not differentiated them in Table 7. In fact the faculties of the two colleges are so similar in these respects that the data for the two colleges could have been combined as well without losing any information or altering any conclusions. Since over a third of the faculty members do not even attend

the meetings of their professional society annually, it is not surprising that so few have held an office in or participated on a program of the society.

Although we observe little difference between the lay and religious faculties and even between the colleges in involvement in professional societies, there is a markedly different picture concerning research grants and/or authorship. Several interesting observations

Table 8

Authorship and Research Grants During Last Five Years

	Women's College			Men's College		
	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
I. Publications						
Five or more items	8%	11%	11%	0%	9%	6%
One to four items	37	43	37	10	36	30
None	55	46	52	90	55	64
II. Research Grant						
Yes	17%	11%	13%	0%	5%	%
No	83	89	87	100	95	97

result from a study of Table 8: (1) Even though neither college is especially remarkable in this type of scholarly contribution, the women's college is distinctly stronger in both areas than the men's college. (2) In both colleges the lay faculty are more productive of writing and at the men's college of research than the religious faculty, the differences being greatest at the men's college. (3) Over half the faculty at both colleges have done no publishing in the last five years. There is evidence that the faculty would like to do more research than that reported in Table 8. When the faculty were asked to indicate how much of their professional time they actually spent on research and how much they preferred to spend, the answers from both colleges indicated a preference for increased time for research. At the women's college the respondents spend an average of 17% of the time doing research but prefer to spend 27% in that activity; the two figures for the men's college are 11% and 24%.

While the record of the faculty contribution to their profession outside the college is small, they have made substantial intramural contributions. They were asked the

question, "In addition to your normal teaching and research responsibilities, what are some of the ways you have served the College during the last three years?" Table 9 summarizes their answers and reveals the considerable extent of their contributions. Again, the figures for the religious and lay members of the faculties differ so little that it hardly seemed necessary to crowd the table by adding the numerical breakdown for them. The interest in their

Table 9

Participation in Certain College Activities

	Women's College	Men's College
I. Spoke at alumnae and/or public gatherings in behalf of the College		
Yes	42%	47%
No	58	53
II. Served on departmental committees		
Yes	67%	75%
No	33	25
III. Served on college committees		
Yes	98%	76%
No	2	24
IV. Attended faculty meetings with great regularity		
Yes	93%	81%
No	7	19

colleges which has been shown by the remarkable fidelity to attendance at faculty meetings, the service on committees and in speechmaking on behalf of the colleges bodes well for the establishment of a functioning pattern of faculty participation in academic governance.

The preceding nine tables contain the descriptive information about the faculties which the questionnaires made available. This section concludes with the following summary listing of some of the conclusions which were spelled out in it.

Similiarities Between Colleges

Re: Religious and Lay Comparisons

Religious are more likely than laymen to hold upper academic ranks.

Religious faculty hold higher degrees than laymen.

Lay faculty stay at the college a much shorter time than religious.

Laymen are younger on the average than religious.

Laymen publish more often than religious do.

Re: Total Faculty Groups

Over a third of the faculty do not have steady participation in their professional societies.

Faculties prefer to spend more time on research than they do.

Faculties give considerable intramural extraclass service to the colleges.

At least half the faculties have done no publishing in the last five years.

Dissimiliarities Between Colleges

Women's College	Men's College
Half of faculty is lay.	Two-thirds of faculty is lay.
Half of laymen are Catholic.	Three-fourths of laymen are Catholic.
Religious with doctorates = 39%	Religious with doctorates = 27%
Average age of faculty = 43.	Average age of faculty = 38.
Tenure status not known by 35% of faculty.	All but 10% know tenure status.
Half of faculty have not published in last 5 years.	Two-thirds of faculty have not published.
Thirteen percent of faculty had research grants.	Three percent of faculty had research grants.

IV. THE STATE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE

FACULTY PERCEPTION OF ITS ROLE IN DECISION MAKING

One way to look at the state of faculty governance is to ascertain what the faculty thinks its role in governance should be and what it thinks its role actually is. To organize and quantify this perception of their idealized and actual roles they were asked to consider seven broad decision areas: academic affairs, lay faculty personnel matters, religious faculty personnel matters, financial affairs, capital improvements, student affairs, and public and alumni affairs. For each of the seven areas the two roles were compared by selecting for each role one of the choices on a five-point scale representing a continuum of authority going from faculty to administrative dominance. The higher the rating, the greater the administrative dominance. A description of the continuum and the mean weights for the seven areas are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Mean Weights on Scale of Faculty-Administration Dominance in Decision Making

SCALE:
1 - faculty determines always; administration has no role
2 - administration recommends to faculty; faculty decides
3 - joint decision
4 - faculty recommends to administration; administration decides
5 - administration determines always; faculty has no role

	Women's College *		Men's College *	
Area of Decision	Actual Role	Idealized Role	Actual Role	Idealized Role
Academic affairs	3.5	2.7	3.6	2.8
Lay personnel matters	4.5	3.6	4.3	3.5
Religious personnel matters	4.8	3.8	4.6	3.6
Financial affairs	4.5	3.7	4.5	3.7
Capital improvements	4.5	3.5#	4.6	3.9#
Student affairs	4.1	3.2	4.2	3.4
Public and alumni affairs	4.4	3.6	4.7	3.9

* Differences between pairs of means in all seven areas were statistically significant at the 1% probability level.

\# Difference between these two means significant at 1% level

There are several ways the data of Table 10 may be analyzed to provide meaningful comparisons — comparisons among the areas of decision making, comparisons between colleges and between faculty perceptions of their idealized and actual roles in governance. A question to ask concerning the seven areas of decision making is: just how dominant a role do the faculties feel they should have in the various areas? An examination of the second and fourth columns of Table 10 shows that the faculties feel there should be across-the-board joint decision making, with the administration taking the more (sometimes only slightly more) dominant role than the faculty. Only in the area of academic affairs do the faculties feel that dominance should be in their direction. A mean weight of three indicates joint decision with neither group having dominance; higher weights indicate administrative dominance, lower ones faculty dominance. In the entire table the only mean weights which are less than three are those for decisions about academic affairs. It is of special interest that the only means near three are those for decision making in student affairs, which on the questionnaire included discipline, government, recreation, and related matters. In these days when students across the country are complaining about faculty inattention, it is particularly encouraging to see this evidence of faculty desire to be involved in student affairs outside the classroom.

It is clear, then, that these faculties wish to have the dominant role in decisions about academic affairs and to have nearly equal power with the administration in decisions about student affairs. They want to share in decisions in all other areas also, although they feel that the administration should have the dominant role in these other areas.

But is the state of decision making actually what the faculty feels it should be? The data in Table 10 show that the answer is surely negative. There is no clearer differentiation between columns of data in this whole study than between the sets comparing the faculties' idealized and actual roles in governance. Examining the sets of columns for

either college shows them to be clearly different. The faculties see strong administrative dominance existing in every area. To be very sure that these differences were actually significant and did not appear simply by chance, the usual statistical probability tests were run on the seven pairs of means for each college. In every area at both colleges the tests demonstrated clearly the high probability of real differences. From the viewpoint of the faculties, decision making is not what they feel it should be.

Do the two colleges differ in their approach to any of these areas of decision making? The statistical tests of the differences between the means in the two columns labeled "idealized role" and the pairs of means indicating "actual roles" showed that in all areas but one the faculties of the two colleges think very much alike in these matters. The only area in which the faculties think differently is that of capital improvements, the faculty of the men's college being willing to concede much greater dominance to the administration than the faculty at the women's college. Other than the area of capital improvements, the two faculties agree on what should be; and they see their present situations of high administrative dominance as being the same in every area.

In concluding this section on faculty perception of its role in decision making it will prove helpful as a guide to uncovering faculty attitudes to read some of the respondents' comments concerning these seven areas of decision making. These volunteered comments were numerous and often directed toward a certain administrative position or office. A sample of the more general statements from each area follows. The number of positive and negative comments given here reflects the overall distribution of them among the total group.

Academic Affairs

- It's pretty cut and dried — decisions are made by administration.
- The present "self study" may be interpreted as a joint project of faculty, students and administration. However, it is not yet known if the recommendation proposed by the various committees will be influential in administrative decisions.

Lay Faculty Personnel Matters

- Faculty role is to do spade work, but responsibilities really end there. Faculty not really asked for evaluation of need.
- Administration can't know all the angles. They simply are not in position to know people as fellow workers.

Religious Faculty Personnel Matters

- Perhaps like the Jesuits, religious might apply for positions.
- Only Mother General should have this right. We work under a vow of obedience.
- Why must chairmanships be a life-time appointment? 4 - 6 years is a reasonable time limit.
- Unfortunately, it's all in the hands of the President of the Board of Directors. This arrangement is shortsighted. Also, aggressive individuals are heard and get what they demand. No overall policies.

Financial Affairs

- Communications very poor -- create much tension.
- Budget suggestions are permitted, but if not sanctioned by department head, suggestions die there. Again, aggressive persons are heard and demands met to "keep peace."
- No one tells us what our budget is.

Capital Improvements

- Often contrary to faculty approval.
- Results of committee studies are useless if administration doesn't act on them.

Student Affairs

- Faculty hasn't time to be deeply involved here.
- The students should have an effective role in determining student affairs.
- Mostly pro forma consultation -- impression of tight rein by administration.
- A SAD SITUATION. Both faculty and students dislike the situation.

Public and Alumni Affairs

- We need a Public Relations Office and staff to work with faculty, administration and students.

FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH ITS ROLE IN DECISION MAKING

A second way to look at the state of faculty governance is to analyze the faculty's satisfaction with the role they are playing in decision making. Their notions about satisfaction were ascertained in several ways. The respondents were asked, "how would you say the faculty, as a whole, feels about its present role in decision making?" They gave their answers on the four-point scale shown in Table 11. They were also requested to comment on what they felt contributes most to faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Table 11

Mean Weights on Scale of Faculty Satisfaction with Decision Making Role

SCALE: 1 - very well satisfied
2 - satisfied
3 - dissatisfied
4 - very dissatisfied

	Women's College	Men's College
Religious faculty	3.2*	2.8
Lay faculty	2.8*	2.8
Total Faculty	3.0	2.8

* The difference between these two means was found to be statistically significant at the 5% probability level.

The mean weights of each partial and of the total group all balance at the "dissatisfied" category. This very clear evidence of dissatisfaction is not unexpected; the comparisons in the previous section of this paper between the faculties' idealized conception of what its role should be and what it believes its role is in reality revealed substantial disparity; and if people find things are not as they should be it is highly probably that they are dissatisfied.

When statistical analyses were made of the pairs of means in Table 11, no difference between colleges was found to be noteworthy. There is no evidence to support a supposition that the faculty at one college are more satisfied or dissatisfied than at the other. All

Table 12

What Contributes Most to Faculty Satisfaction

Rank Order		Number of Comments
1	Faculty opinion being sought	20
2	Being appreciated and professionally respected	10
3	Work with students	9
4	Academic freedom	8
5	Friendly spirit	7
6	Knowing what is going on	6
7	Work load, pay, facilities	4
		64

means polarize around the category "dissatisfied." Studies of their answers to two additional questions reveal some of the sources of their dissatisfaction.

The respondents were asked the open-ended question, "what contributes most to faculty satisfaction?" Over 70% of those from the women's college and 53% of those at the men's college gave answers to that question. There was a total of 64 comments. The content and tone of them were so much the same from one college to the other that the comments were tabulated jointly in Table 12, and were easily classified into the seven categories shown in the table. They are listed in the order of frequency and constitute a set of interesting guidelines for creating a satisfied faculty.

When these faculty members expressed what they felt would contribute <u>most</u> to faculty satisfaction, their most numerous and strongest statements indicated that they desire a role in decision making. Typical comments were:

- Being consulted before decisions are handed down.
- Treatment as concerned participant in college affairs.
- Realization that faculty has a vital interest and wishes to play a vital part in the total college.
- Sense of participation in significant, not nominal, way.

Their choice of participation in governance as the predominant means to faculty satisfaction is in accord with the data of the previous section which revealed the disparity between their

Table 13

What Contributes Most to Faculty Dissatisfaction

Rank Order		Number of Comments
1	All decision making by administration	28
2	Lack of communication between faculty and administration	27
3	Salary and tenure policies, work load, lack of facilities	14
4	Inept administrators	6
5	Faculty meetings inadequate	3
		78

actual role in decision making and the role they felt they should be assuming.

The same consistency was evident in the answers to the question, "what contributes most to faculty dissatisfaction?" It seemed easier for the faculty to state causes of dissatisfaction; a great number responded to the question when it was stated negatively (82% at the women's; 74% at the men's college). Their comments are summarized in Table 13.

The two types of comments most frequently given refer directly to the desire of the faculty to participate in governance. Examples of statements which were tabulated in the first category (all decision making by administration) are:

- decision making in hands of few
- decisions "steam-rolled" through faculty or key issues avoided completely
- administration that is unable (unwilling?) to really allow faculty involvement in policy-making of the college
- agenda seems decided on before it is discussed in faculty meetings; always eventually in accordance with wishes of administration
- being railroaded

Some of the statements included in the second category (lack of communication) are:

- lack of freedom to express opinions in faculty meetings
- lack of communication between faculty and the upper echelons of the administration
- administrative secrecy in certain matters
- hearing about events, changes, etc. from some source other than the proper one
- being kept in the dark

The answers to the three questions aimed at the subject of faculty satisfaction reveal quite consistently and clearly that the faculties are dissatisfied with their present role in decision making. They earnestly desire a share in governance and hope for the development of new methods of communication.

CONDITIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION

This part of the study is focused on ways and means of involving the faculty in decision making. The several approaches taken include: (1) an estimate of the use of various organizational devices, (2) a description of ways used to influence decisions, directly or indirectly, through individuals; and (3) some indication of faculty and administrative attitudes toward participation.

Organizational Devices. The five devices listed in Table 14 are among those most frequently used by colleges to elicit faculty participation in governance. The faculties were asked to assess, using a five-point scale, the frequency with which each was used to provide opportunity for meaningful participation in decision making. The lower the weight,

Table 14

Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Extent of Use of Devices for Decision Making

SCALE: 1 - always
2 - often
3 - sometimes
4 - seldom
5 - never

Devices (in order of use)	Women's College#	Men's College#
Departmental staff meetings	2.8	2.4
Faculty meetings	2.8	2.9
Standing faculty committees	2.8	3.0
Ad hoc faculty committees	3.2	3.0
The Senate	3.5	*

* The men's college has no organization called a Senate.
# In no category were means between colleges significantly different.

the greater the use. Perhaps the most significant observation that can be made of the resulting data is that for none of these five devices for decision making is there a mean weight that indicates more than "sometime" use, except for departmental staff meetings at the men's college. The weights do show, however, that none of the devices is completely without use; there are no mean weights which indicate use between "seldom" and "never."

A particularly telling fact is revealed in comparing these weights with those obtained by Dykes from the faculty at a very large midwestern university (4:51). The small colleges studied here have a poorer record of faculty participation in governance than the large university does. Although one of the advantages a small college usually claims to have is a family kind of living, there is evidence in Dykes' study that the family communication is greater in at least one very large university than it is at either of these small colleges.

A statistical analysis of the differences between the means of the two colleges in each of the categories revealed no significant disparities. The colleges appear to be very much alike in the extent to which use is made of these devices for faculty participation in decision making.

Besides being asked to estimate the extent to which the various devices are used, the respondents were invited to comment, if they wished, on the devices. The comments regarding the usefulness of the departmental staff meetings were far from indifferent. They were about evenly divided between favorable and acerbic. Much depends on the department. The comments reminded me of a "smile" which has been passed about among researchers in administration: "some departments have chairmen, and some chairmen have departments." Illustrative statements from the faculties follow:

- Meetings are often, but chairman has formed own decisions and opinions, therefore, meetings are mere formality.
- Meaningful where majority are lay faculty - never with religious.
- Department is small enough that informal discussions suffice.
- Members too overloaded or would participate effectively.

- Things work well in our department.
- We need to alternate departmental chairmanships.
- Our department chairman is old, afraid to spend money, make needed changes.

Faculty meetings were under much greater fire from the respondents than departmental staff meetings, although comments were limited to the women's college faculty. There was only one favorable comment but ten times as many negative ones. Among the comments were:

- good opportunity for airing views, questions
- this <u>really</u> frustrates me
- monthly farce; decisions are made outside faculty meetings
- climate not conducive to two-way discussions
- worst example - generally 'busy work' - no time for new business and comments discouraged, votes <u>often</u> (in fairness-not always) are rubber stamps

The use of committees brought forth no free comment from the men's college; perhaps the substantial departmental level satisfaction faculty members find there gives them a more positive orientation toward committee work. From the women's college there were no favorable comments offered about the committees. Some of the criticisms were:

- To be exact our committee meets once a year. The chairman does all the talking. The members of the committee are supposed to blot it up ! ! ! ! ! !
- Very poor. We are serving the ideas of a few in administration.
- Just names in the Catalogue. Looks good. IS IT WORTH FIGHTING FOR?

The conclusions that can be drawn from these considerations of organizational devices for faculty participation in decision making is that they are not used very effectively. Furthermore, there appears to be support in the comments for the supposition that the faculty would like to see an increase in their effectiveness.

<u>Influence of Individuals</u>. Since the faculty member's approach to administrators is a very real kind of participation in governance, it seemed worthwhile to ascertain to whom they go when they want to influence a decision. In the attempt to discover these patterns of

individual influence in the decision making process, a most interesting and pointed difference between the lay and religious faculties was uncovered. In presenting most other tables in this study there was so little variation between the two groups that it seemed foolish to fragment the tabulations by presenting them separately. But to combine them in this instance would hide a definite disparity between their approaches to academic authority.

The faculties were asked the question, "to whom would you be most likely to go in an effort to influence a decision about which you felt strongly?" They were asked to answer separately for department level and college-wide decisions. From the results shown in Table 15 it is possible to see that variations between religious and laymen in the patterns of percentages are the same from one college to another. This unusual religious-lay dichotomy must have some other explanation than simply personality differences among administrative officers. Religious and laymen, no matter which college, take different avenues to influence department as well as college-wide decisions. One can see, especially in reading the department decision section of the table, that lay faculty are much more likely than

Table 15

Where Faculty Members Go to Influence Decisions

	Women's College			Men's College		
Department Level Decisions	Religious	Lay	Total	Religious	Lay	Total
President or vice-president	9%	11%	9%	10%	0%	3%
Dean	18	0	9	20	9	13
Department chairman	59	86	74	70	86	81
Influential professor	5	0	2	0	5	3
Other	9	3	6	0	0	0
College Level Decisions						
President or vice-president	59%	49%	54%	27%	45%	41%
Dean	25	18	21	46	31	35
Department chairman	0	11	5	18	14	15
Influential professor	8	11	9	0	5	3
Other	8	11	11	9	5	6

religious faculty at both colleges to abide by the generally accepted protocol of the academic world and to go first to the department chairman before jumping channels of authority. Furthermore, at the women's college this tendency to go straight to higher authorities with one's problems exists also at the level of college-wide decisions.

The root causes of this situation are probably closely related to the ramifications of the religious vow of obedience. The personal life of the religious (that is, his personal ties with the religious community) and his academic life often are confused or in conflict, and consequently problems which are actually professional and not personal are carried to the religious superior instead of to the person in immediate academic authority.

While this jumping of lines of authority generally prevails among religious at both colleges, the department chairmen at the men's college do appear to enjoy greater confidence from the faculty than those at the women's college, no matter what level of decision making is involved. This is a second indication of departmental satisfaction at the men's college and correlates with the information in Table 14 concerning the use of departmental staff meetings as governing devices. The observation is also verified by the comments made by the respondents as to why they would choose the person they did. Of the comments made, a greater percentage from the men's college than from the women's college were complimentary to the department chairmen. The following pairs of contrasting comments will demonstrate what is meant by the difference.

- He is approachable and has the power to decide.	vs	- The logical recourse
- Because he operates his department in a democratic manner, where possible.	vs	- I strongly believe in channels of authority.

Another manner in which faculty might influence official decisions by way of individual contact is through informal arrangements such as coffee breaks, social gatherings, and so forth. Table 16 demonstrates that this device is used even less often than the formal devices which were discussed earlier. "Sometime" to "rarely" seems to be the extent of their use.

Table 16

Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Use of Informal Faculty Groups for Influencing Decisions

SCALE: 1 - very often
2 - often
3 - sometimes
4 - rarely
5 - not at all

	Women's College	Men's College
Department level decisions *	3.5	3.1
College level decisions *	3.9	3.5

*In neither category were means between colleges significantly different.

From both colleges the comments about informal groups indicated a considerable range of opinion concerning the usefulness of informal gatherings. The following typical comments demonstrate this.

- Department decisions are made by head alone.
- Our department rarely has a social gathering.
- Wish we had more of this!
- They sometimes seem to "get things started." There are "in groups" and "out groups" and in certain instances it does make a difference.
- Much discussion about department affairs occurs at these times.

Attitudes. This discussion of conditions which affect participation in governance concludes with a consideration of attitudes as the faculties perceive them -- the attitude of the administration toward faculty participation in decision making as well as the attitude of the faculty itself. The respondents were asked very simply to state what they felt was the attitude of the administration and of the faculty toward shared governance.

How does the faculty view the administration's attitude toward shared governance? Virtually all the respondents at both colleges gave an opinion in this matter. It was quite easy to categorize the comments. They were classified into three groups: definitely and totally unfavorable, definitely and totally favorable, or mixed. I have used the term

"mixed," though it should be added that the mixed statements were generally the type that "damn by faint praise." Some samples of statements from the three groups will clarify these categorical differences.

Favorable
- Willingness to consider faculty opinions.
- Cautious but open-minded.

Mixed
- Apparent interest but no provision made.
- Administration appears to invite faculty participation. Cannot say that faculty opinion determines policy however.
- They are unwittingly unconscious of the real need, although they are presently being made aware.

Unfavorable
- There is no meaningful faculty participation in decision making.
- nil
- I don't think the administration welcomes opinions contrary to their own.
- Lip service, even administration under tight rein of order's governing body.

Table 17 contains the count of the comments and shows that the faculties generally do not feel administrative support in this matter. Only 31% of the comments made by men's college faculty were really favorable, and the figure was even lower, 21%, for the faculty of the women's college.

Table 17

Faculty Perceptions of Administration Attitudes Toward Shared Governance

	Women's College		Men's College	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Favorable comments	11	21%	8	31%
Favorable in theory; limited in practice	18	35	12	46
Unfavorable comments	23	44	6	23

Does the generally negative faculty feeling about administrative attitudes carry over to their feelings about themselves? Do they view themselves as any more enthusiastic about participation than the administrators are? When they were asked how they viewed the attitude of the faculty, most respondents did state an opinion; 98% of the women's

college faculty, 77% of the men's answered the question. Their comments could be divided into five categories. Sample comments for each category are given below to clarify the meanings of the five labels which are used in Table 18:

Desire to Participate More
- Would like to feel wanted and needed in the college. Faculty has years of experience and knowledge.
- I believe it would be willing to assume the responsibility this would demand.
- It is changing. The faculty is beginning to organize and demand a more weighty voice.

Frustration with the Present
- The faculty is not monolithic. Some of us say damn the consequences-advancement - others live the life of the coward.
- Faculty would like to feel that their opinions carried more weight in decision making and that more decisions should be really made instead of forever forming committees which never seem to conclude anything concrete and constructive.
- resentful

Indifference
- Generally apathetic. Most would shy away from the responsibility and work involved in formulating and executing policy decisions.
- So-so

Cautious, Fearful, Timid
- Faculty members like to talk about decision-making. This does not always indicate a willingness to "take a stand" in a controversial matter.
- On departmental level, the faculty seems cautious to the point of timidity. My attitude on this level is not cautious so much as stealthy. Experience has taught me to be devious rather than forthright.

Satisfaction with Present
- There appears to be mutual respect.

The 81 comments are summarized in Table 18. As can be noted there, the comments reveal each faculty as having a very positive attitude toward participation in decision making. Although they see the administration as being unfavorably disposed toward or even indifferent to faculty governance, they perceive themselves as quite desirous of facilitating it. The first two categories should really be combined to ascertain how many comments leaned toward participation. Only 11% of the comments from the women's

Table 18

Faculty Perception of Their Own Attitudes Toward Participation in Governance

Nature of Statement	Women's College		Men's College	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Desire to participate more	18	33%	14	54%
Frustration with present lack	17	31	5	19
Indifference	10	18	4	15
Caution, fear; timidity	4	7	2	8
Satisfaction with present	6	11	1	4
	55		26	

college and 4% from the men's indicate satisfaction with the present state of things.

This desire for a larger share in governance seems to emerge no matter from what angle the state of faculty governance is studied. It was manifest in all the tables in the section on faculty perception of its proper role, in the table describing the direct measures of faculty satisfaction with their role, and in the section just being concluded on conditions and arrangements affecting participation.

A general conclusion which can be drawn from this section is that the usual devices for participation in governance, both the organizational ones and the person-to-person ones, are neither used as extensively nor as effectively as they might be. Furthermore, the faculty thinks of itself as more positively oriented toward shared governance than the administration is. And these conclusions can hardly be stated as tentative; however the subject is viewed, all the data point in the same direction.

IMPEDIMENTS TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

A dual attempt was made to uncover the impediments to faculty participation in governance. Since I believe that academic community cannot exist without consensus, and consensus cannot be reached without adequate communication, it seemed that a "freedom to dissent" question might be in order. Therefore the first kind of impediment to be studied was lack of freedom to dissent. A second approach to discovering relevant impediments

was to list certain possible personal, organizational and administrative hindrances and ask the respondents how often they actually do hinder faculty involvement.

The "freedom to dissent" section contained two questions, one for which the response was structured and the other free. The structured question was: how free do you think faculty members feel to take positions on important issues which are contrary to those of the administration? The unstructured question was: could you give some indication why the faculty does or does not feel free?

The first question was answered on the four-point scale shown in Table 19; the higher the weight, the less is the freedom to dissent. At both colleges the religious and lay faculty think so much alike on this matter that the data are not presented separately. But even though there is unity of thought regarding dissent within each college, the data certainly highlight one of the few major differences between the two colleges. While on the average the faculty of the men's college feels "fairly free" to dissent, the faculty of the women's college feels "not very free." When statistical tests are made of the two mean weights (1.8 and 2.7), they are shown to differ significantly -- to indicate not a chance but a real difference between the two colleges. Freedom to dissent is not at its highest level at the men's college, but at the women's college it is far from what might be expected for an academic community.

Table 19

How Free the Faculty Members Feel to Take Positions on Important Issues Which are Contrary to Those of the Administration

Weight	Women's College	Men's College
1 - Completely free	8%	34%
2 - Fairly free	27	47
3 - Not very free	50	19
4 - Not free at all	15	0
Mean Weights *	2.7	1.8

* These two means are significantly different at the 1% probability level.

The answers to the open-ended question as to why the faculty does or does not feel free to dissent illuminate the difference between the two colleges. Comments from the women's college were twice the number of those from the men's college and they were far more vehement and resentful.

A study of the comments from the MEN'S COLLEGE shows about as many favorable as unfavorable ones. Some of each type follows:

-There is a rather tolerant attitude by and large at this college.
- Liberal policies of college.
- The administration seems to always try and consider any recommendations made by the faculty. They encourage these recommendations.
- There is no uniform reaction — judged by activities. Some are naturally timid or assertive. Some feel that any opposition to authority (administration) is disloyalty. Some fear for their job or advancement. Some feel that opposition on basic issues is necessary for growth.
-Rather difficult to assess but there still hangs the specter of control from the monastery.

The reasons why the faculty of the WOMEN'S COLLEGE does or does not feel free to dissent are difficult to analyze. Their reasons for not feeling free are so diverse as to defy neat categorization. As might be expected from Table 19, there are about ten times as many negative as positive comments. Examples, in that proportion, follow:

- Have experienced and observed free discussion of many opposing views.
- In the final analysis, I really feel it makes little difference; therefore, why take a stand?
- Either subtle criticism is offered or an individual is publicly "cut down." This can be very difficult to endure even if one is not the subject of attack.
- Lay faculty is often branded iconoclastic if view is not conservative.
- In the last few years this college has lost some of its most creative thinkers! Is it because the thought of these teachers differs from that of the administration and of the Order?
- Tenure for the lay faculty; disturbance among those who have control over the personal lives for religious faculty.
- Cowards, all!
- It is generally believed that decisions are signed and sealed before new propositions or revisions are brought before the faculty for discussion and vote.
- Lack of chance for communication.

- The attitudes of the very few administrators who seem to have control.
- Administration's real preference is for "don't rock the boat."

Thus it is seen that the first type of impediment to be considered -- a feeling of lack of freedom to dissent — does exist to some extent at both colleges but to a much greater degree at the women's college.

A second means of measuring possible relevant impediments was to list ten of the reasons which are sometimes given for a lack of faculty involvement in administration. Three of these are reasons personal to the faculty members, five have to do with organizational structure and function, and two are directly related to administrators. The respondents were asked to estimate, on a five-point scale, how often these ten things are impediments at their college. The lower the weights, the more serious is the impediment. The reasons and the mean weights are listed in Table 20.

When the faculty consider the three factors which are personal to them they do not recognize any serious impediment except for indifference at the men's college. The two colleges differ significantly in the way they view indifference (men's college being more indifferent) and the time which governance takes from teaching and/or research (women's college considering this a greater impediment). Their absence from campus is rarely an impediment.

The faculties find more serious impediments in certain facets of organizational structure and function. Seen as rather serious impediments at both colleges are procrastination, time spent on inconsequential matters, confusion concerning lines of authority and the authoritarian structure of the life-style of the religious. Neither college views the cleavage between lay and religious faculty as serious, but a statistically significant difference between the means of the two colleges on this variable allows the statement that at the women's college there is notably less cleavage than at the men's college.

Table 20

Mean Weights on Scale Indicating Extent to Which Certain Factors are Impediments to Faculty Participation in Decision Making

SCALE:
1 - very often
2 - often
3 - sometimes
4 - rarely
5 - not at all

Faculty	Women's College	Men's College
*Indifference of faculty members	3.0	2.5
*Takes time from teaching and/or research	2.9	3.4
Absence from campus (e.g., meetings, consulting)	3.8	3.8
Organizational Structure and Function		
Procrastination in decision making; deliberations drag on	2.2	2.2
Too much time spent on inconsequential matters	2.2	2.5
Confusion concerning lines of authority	2.6	2.5
Authoritarian structure of the life-style of religious	2.7	2.5
*Cleavage between lay and religious faculty	3.6	3.0
Administration		
*Administrative secrecy	2.2	2.8
*Faculty ideas and opinions are not really valued	2.6	3.3

*Differences between means for the colleges on this variable are statistically significant at the 1% probability level.

There are pronounced differences between faculty feeling at the two colleges about impediments created by the administration. Administrative secrecy sometimes is an impediment at the men's college but is seen as significantly greater and as a serious impediment at the women's college. There is also a stronger feeling at the women's college than at the men's concerning the administration's failure to value their ideas and opinions, though both mean weights are within the range of what can be labeled a "sometime" impediment.

All of the 11 possible impediments which were presented to the faculty, except absence from campus, were seen by one faculty or the other as being at least partial hindrances to faculty governance, although very few of them were viewed as serious hindrances by both colleges.

SUMMARY OF RELIGIOUS-LAY AND COLLEGE COMPARISONS

Religious-Lay Comparisons. Of the questionnaire items which referred to the state of faculty governance, 33 were answered using scales for which mean weights could be calculated. When the 33 pairs of mean weights for the religious and laymen at each college were analyzed using the statistical probability tests it was found that only seven of these 66 pairs of means were significantly different. That is, on practically all the variables having to do with shared governance, the two groups at both colleges think very much alike.

Two of the seven significant differences between the thinking of the religious and lay faculty were found in the men's college data.

(1) The religious faculty would assign a more dominant role than the lay faculty would assign to the administration in decision making about financial affairs.

(2) The lay faculty would assign a more dominant role to the administration than the religious would in decision making about public and alumni affairs.

The other five differences in religious-lay thinking were observed in the data from the women's college.

(3) The lay faculty would assign a more dominant role than the religious would assign to the administration in decision making about capital improvements.

(4) When the faculty members were asked to say how the faculty, as a whole, feels about its present role in decision making, the religious perceived the faculty in general to be more deeply dissatisfied than the laymen saw them to be. The reader will recall, however, that the mean weight for the combined groups indicated a general dissatisfaction.

(5) The religious take a more optimistic view of the so-called "religious-lay cleavage" than do the laymen, seeing it as much less an impediment to shared governance than the lay faculty do.

(6) Somehow the lay faculty are more sanguine than the religious faculty in their estimate of how much their ideas and opinions are valued by the administration. That their

ideas and opinions are not valued appears to the religious faculty to be often an impediment to shared governance. The lay faculty see this as considerably less serious.

(7) Religious faculty members are also much more keenly aware than laymen are of administrative secrecy as being an impediment to faculty participation in decision making.

Since there were only seven significant differences out of a possible 66, it is fair to say that the unanimity between the lay and religious faculty on the subject of shared governance is pronounced. And it is even more marked in the fact that a study of these seven variables reveals no real pattern of diversity; no single kind of difference was found at both colleges and the differences appear to be unrelated. There are just no indications that on the subject of shared governance, religious and laymen as groups are different from each other.

Outside the sphere of religious-lay thinking on shared governance, there are some minor signs of disparity between the two groups, especially at the women's college. I refer to what was indicated by comments written on the questionnaires, and I say the signs are minor in that of a total of 617 comments, only 17 made any reference to lay-religious faculty relations. Most of the comments were made by laymen, and four of them lauded the relationship between the two groups. The 13 remaining ones were mostly from the women's college and were of three types: (1) complaints of the religious faculty's naïvté concerning the financial and family problems of the lay faculty, (2) remarks decrying the lack of opportunities for communication between the two groups and (3) statements of discontent that "decisions seem to be made ultimately by religious faculty and not lay." Only one of the 17 comments was bitter in tone, and it revealed that the respondent misread the question to which the comment was appended.

Although there is some evidence among the data of this study that lay-religious faculty relations are not perfect, there seems to be no indication of as serious a dichotomy as one finds bemoaned in recent literature (7:312; 12:175). The matter of appointments and

promotions among both lay and religious, salaries for the laymen, and the present heavily authoritarian and structured life-style of the religious seem to be the only devisive factors to appear in this study.

Comparisons Between Colleges. When the 33 faculty governance variables of this study were compared for the two colleges, the institutions were seen to be significantly different in their opinions about seven of them. For the most part the two faculties think alike.

But how do they differ? Their perceptions of their actual roles in the seven areas of governance (academic affairs, personnel matters, financial affairs, etc.; see Table 10) were practically identical. And their judgments of what their roles should be ideally were the same in six of these areas. Only in the area of capital improvements do they differ; the men's college faculty would give the administration a more dominant role in making these decisions than would the faculty of the women's college.

Other indications of a lesser amount of administration-faculty strain at the men's college than at the women's college is evidenced in the significant differences between means in three other areas. At the men's college the faculty feel more free to take positions on important issues which are contrary to those of the administration and they do not see as serious impediments to faculty governance either administrative secrecy or lack of administrative respect for their ideas and opinions.

Perhaps those signs of relaxed faculty-administration relations can be partially explained by another difference between the two colleges. The faculty of the men's college indicate a significantly greater amount of faculty indifference to shared governance than is evidenced at the women's college.

Two other differences between the colleges concern what the faculties consider impediments to shared governance. The women's college faculty see shared governance as being more seriously impeded by the fact that it takes time from teaching and/or research

than do the faculty at the men's college. And the men's college faculty see the cleavage between the lay and religious faculty as being a more serious impediment than do the faculty of the women's college.

Although for the most part the faculties of the two colleges share the same views about the state of faculty governance at their respective colleges, there does seem to be less indication of administration-faculty strain at the men's college.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

I have tried to present as clearly as possible the facts of faculty governance as the respondents revealed them in answering the questionnaires; and I have attempted to do this without making value judgments. How, however, I would like to leave the realm of description and analysis and make recommendations (value judgments) which I see as being warranted by the data. They are listed in the order in which they occurred to me as I analyzed the data; no priority ratings are intended.

1. The matter of tenure status needs to be clarified for all faculty members in both colleges; the data in Table 6 show that a substantial portion of the faculties do not know whether or not they have tenure. I recommend that the faculty and administration study the tradition and practice of this concept in higher education and publish a statement of principles and procedures for determining tenure for the collegiate community.

It seems particularly important and urgent that the whole matter of contracts, tenure status, and rank be clarified for the religious faculty since over half of them have no idea of their present academic status. Why should the intellectual who belongs to a religious community not be included in the usual norms established for the academician by the AAUP (6:322)? Clear equitable policies and practices of appointments and promotions for all members of the faculty groups are as beneficial for the total institution and for higher education in general as they are for the individual faculty member. It seems especially

poignant that the religious faculty are treated as second-class citizens professionally when at both colleges they, in general, hold higher degrees and have been with the colleges longer than have the laymen. Definite steps should be taken to "separate that concept of obedience appropriate to the religious life from that personal autonomy necessary for the intellectual life." (7:228). There appears to be no reason why the vow of obedience need deprive the collegiate community and its individual members of this source of unity and dignity. Saint Louis University and Saint Mary's College at Notre Dame have both made the transition successfully.

The following two brief statements from the AAUP Statement of Principles support this recommendation:

> Faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions, and actions resulting in tenure, should require the active participation and, except in rare cases and for compelling reasons, the concurrence of the faculty, through established committees and procedures.
>
> The selection of presidents, academic deans and other principal academic administrative officers, and the creation or abolition of their offices, should be effected by procedures that ensure the active participation of the faculty. (6:322)

2. Plans should be made for an increased emphasis on faculty research. It has been traditional in the smaller liberal arts colleges to focus attention on teaching with research being secondary in importance. But the exiguous amount of research and publishing reported in Table 8 of this paper shows that very little importance is attached to research and publishing in the operation of the two institutions studied. In future planning for use of development funds a high priority should be given to releasing of some faculty from heavy teaching loads to engage in research. The faculties have indicated a desire for this.

Research should be encouraged not for the sake of research only but for what it does to vitalize teaching. What Dean Lloyd Woodburne said at the University of Michigan

nearly two decades ago is still true. (Underlining mine)

> Important as the intellectual by-products of research are to the scholar himself, they are just as important in his function as a teacher. The very process . . . makes for enthusiastic and vital teaching. . . When a man gets excited about the material of a course and brings in new examples and fuller explanations each year, the students know quickly that they receive an intellectual quickening. They realize, although perhaps imperfectly, that the teacher is still a student and is bringing to them the enrichment of added material infused into the course continuously. (14:74)

The Dean's observation has been verified in this decade by several studies of student evaluations of teachers. The most recent study was made at Tufts University and shows clearly that though students were not aware of the publishing and research activities of their instructors, still the teachers they rated as best were the ones who did research regularly. (2:8)

3. Inviting and encouraging the faculty to cooperate with the administration in evaluating all the collegiate agencies for faculty participation in governance and to bring them up to the standards published by the AAUP is strongly recommended. The following excerpt from the AAUP Statement is pertinent:

> The rules governing faculty participation in institutional government should be approved by vote of the faculty concerned, should be officially adopted by the appropriate authority, and published. The methods by which its own representatives are chosen should be determined by the faculty. (6:322)

That the faculties of both colleges are ready and willing to act upon this recommendation is clear from the data of Tables 11, 12 and 13 which reveal their lack of satisfaction with the present structure.

4. Administrative recognition should be given to the interest of the faculty in student affairs in order that this potential for the creation of community can be realized both inside and outside the classroom. The faculties of both colleges rank "student affairs" second in importance to "academic affairs" among the seven areas of decision making, and express a strong feeling that policy decisions on these matters should be made

jointly by faculty and administration. See Table 10.

5. Especially at the women's college, policies and principles for a restructuring of departments should be formulated and published jointly by administration and faculty, with special concern given to policy governing chairmanships. Evidence of the need for change and of the widespread faculty desire for it is abundantly available in the data of this study. Faculty perceptions of the situation are supported by the AAUP Statement of Principles:

> The chairman or head of an academic department, if not directly elected by the members of the department, should be appointed after consultation with, and normally in conformity with the judgment of, the members of the department. He should serve for a limited term, subject to renewals by the same procedure. (6:322)

6. Especially at the women's college, planning for more effective faculty meetings is essential. What should be the primary function of faculty meetings? How can they be made more relevant to campus life? How should they be conducted? The answers to these questions should be reached through faculty-administration consensus before faculty meetings can either become really meaningful instruments of shared governance or serve adequately any other purpose. The information in Table 14 and the faculty comments on this subject give urgency to this recommendation.

7. More open communication on all aspects of academic life is vitally needed. Discontent with faculty meetings is only one of the many signs of the communications breakdown which exists at both colleges, although more seriously at the women's college (see Table 19). No system of shared governance, no agencies that might be set up can be productive without open and free person-to-person encounter of faculty members and administrators with themselves and with each other. Outside professional consultation might be sought to aid in effecting this, perhaps through Basic Encounter Group techniques. This is not a new or even a radical idea in higher education; San Diego College for Women and Alma College are among the many colleges which have been successful in using this idea

of the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute to strengthen and enrich communication within their colleges.

8. Faculty-administration rapport relative to the religious faculty needs special study at both colleges. Evidence of substantial disparity between the religious and lay faculty regarding administrative relationships surfaces from the mass of data in this research. It seems a matter of special concern that, unlike the lay faculty, the religious bypass the generally accepted protocol of the academic world and jump lines of authority in their approach to college administrators, or they take issues to religious superiors instead of to the appropriate academic authority. (Table 15) Furthermore, at the women's college, three significant differences between means for lay and religious faculty show that: (1) the religious are less satisfied with their role in decision making than the lay faculty are, (2) their estimate of the value which the administration places on their ideas and opinions is substantially less, and (3) they are more keenly aware of administrative secrecy than the laymen are. It is simply a fact that the lay faculty have sounder relationships with the administration at these colleges than the religious do. (See the final portion of Section IV.)

Many of the reasons for the lack of harmony are elusive; the sources of the problem must surely be found in both faculty and administrators; and no one person alone can arrive at the causes and suggest solutions. Therefore, I recommend that the religious members of the two academic communities, faculty and administrators, undertake formal means to recognize and to reflect on this problem, and to correct the present situation.

9. Since the problems to be faced in working toward a system of shared governance are difficult ones, it may be helpful to quote the following suggestions concerning shared governance which have been made by educators experienced in college and university administration:

> There is a great tendency to confuse policy making or legislation with management or the execution of policy in the general operation of the program. . . one of the problems in determining the respective roles

> of teacher and administrator is to recognize the need to define management and to assign its functions to the managers rather than undervalue the role of the teaching faculty member by requiring him to take on the work of the specialist in this area. (11:258)

> It has been wisely observed that if you do not want a restrictive policy, do not ask for an opinion — whether from the attorney-general or from a faculty committee . . . as faculties grow and enhance their authority, the expression of their influence also tends to be more formally structured . . . often leads to a condition in which the energy available for creative effort may be sponged up or diverted by the demands of the structure itself. (8:30)

> . . . it is well known that professional self-regulation . . . is usually characterized by resistance to change, and this of course often includes desirable change . . . the possibility always exists, and may sometimes materialize that "campus politicians" or "oligarchs" among the faculty may come to represent their own special concerns more than the interests of their more scholarly colleagues. (5:13)

> . . . the concept of community is not an automatic guarantee that there will be consensus rather than conflict. . . it is naive indeed to suppose that conflict within the academic community can be eliminated by some magic organizational formula. . . In a system of shared power, conflict means frustration of power, a mutual cancellation of purpose and accomplishment, unless conflict becomes consensus. (10:243-244)

> Shared power can be preserved only in a society of shared respect. (10:257)

10. All of the recommendations above are pertinent to both colleges, and their validity is strongly supported in the data from both their faculties. That is, the study shows clearly that, in the matter of shared governance, the two institutions have common problems. My final recommendation, therefore, is that some of the solutions to these problems be sought jointly. At both institutions there has been hope for a stronger cooperative program; and communication between the colleges about their common problems of governance should give substantial impetus to the fulfillment of that hope.

References Cited

1. Bennis, W. G. and Schein, E. H. (editors). Leadership and Motivation: Essays of Douglas McGregor. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.

2. Chaffee, John B. Jr. "'Best' Teachers Publish." The Chronicle of Higher Education 2:8; May 6, 1968.

3. Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1960.

4. Dykes, Archie R. "Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making." September 1967, unpublished.

5. Eley, Lynn W. "The University of California at Berkeley: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." AAUP Bulletin 50:5-13; Spring 1964.

6. "Faculty Participation in College and University Government: Statement of Principles." AAUP Bulletin 48:321-323; Winter 1962.

7. Hassenger, Robert (editor). The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1967.

8. Honer, Stanley M. "Faculty Power and Participation." Junior College Journal 36:28-32; February 1966.

9. Martin, Warren Bryan. "The University as Community." Educational Record 48:320-326; Fall 1967.

10. Millett, John D. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1962.

11. Newburn, H. K. "Faculty and Administration in the Governance of the University." Educational Record 45:255-264; Summer 1964.

12. Pattillo, M. M. and Mackenzie, D. M. Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education 1966.

13. Williams, Robert L. The Administration of Academic Affairs in Higher Education Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1965.

14. Woodburne, Lloyd S. Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers 1950.